

REMARKS

Claims 1, 7, and 13 have been amended. No new claims have been added. Claims 2, 8, and 14 have been cancelled. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the cancelled claims and other claims in this and other applications. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, and 15-18 are pending.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roy (U.S. Patent No. 6,496,859) in view of Owa (U.S. Patent No. 6,348,971). This rejection is respectfully traversed

Each of the independent claims recites the use of an integrated profile which includes a profile of an ideal virtual device. More specifically, claim 1 recites: "... the integrated profile constituting a profile of an ideal virtual device having all the categories of said devices ..." Similarly, claim 7 recites: "... providing beforehand a table containing an integrated profile, ... said integrated profile also including a profile of an ideal virtual device having all the categories of said devices ..." Finally, claim 13 recites: "... creating an integrated profile ... including a profile of an ideal virtual device having all the categories of said devices ..."

Roy discloses a system and method for locating devices over a network. More specifically, Roy teaches using a discovery task which sends discovery requests over a computer network. As network devices respond to the discovery device, Roy builds a profile of the responding devices as a linked list. Significantly, Roy's linked list only includes those devices which responded to the discovery task. As such, the linked list taught by Roy only includes actual devices located on the network which have responded to the discovery task. Roy therefore is devoid of any teaching or suggesting regarding the creation of an integrated profile which includes (or constitutes) an ideal

virtual device because Roy's linked list only includes actual devices. Thus, Roy fails to teach or suggest the above quoted limitations from claims 1, 7, and 13.

The Office Action further cites to Owa, which discloses a system and method for selecting a printer. Owa is cited by the Office Action primarily for its teaching of printer ranking. However, like Roy, Owa is devoid of any teaching or suggestion regarding the use of an integrated profile which includes (or constitutes) an ideal virtual device. Thus Owa also fails to teach or suggest the above quoted limitations from claims 1, 7, and 13.

Claims 1, 7, and 13 are therefore believed to be allowable over the prior art of record. The depending claims, i.e., claims 3-6, 9-12, and 15-18 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reason as their respective independent claims.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: December 31, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark J. Thronson

Registration No.: 33,082

Christopher S. Chow

Registration No.: 46,493

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &

OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicant